DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 472 EC 093 192

AUTHOR Reynolds, Maynard C.
TITLE Trends in Education: Changing Roles of Special Education Personnel.
INSTITUTION University Council for Educational Administration, Columbus, Ohio.
PUB DATE 73
NOTE 43p.; This paper is an edited version of one presented to UCEA in June, 1973

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; *Futures (of Society); *Handicapped Children; *Historical Reviews; *Special Education Teachers; Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

Discussed are the historical aspects of special education and some of the projections for the future, with particular emphasis on the expanding domain in which special educators are expected to serve and the changing boundary lines between special education and other aspects of education. Six major topics are covered (sample subtopics are in parentheses): historical perspective (nineteenth century residential schools), forces and trends in the 1970s (minority groups, individualism, and broadening the mainstream), future trends (some major problem areas, and some predicted organizational restructuring), changing roles of special education personnel (more local educational services for the severely and profoundly handicapped and simplified formal systems for professional standards), general outlook on field developments, and a personal statement of alternatives and preferences (the right to education principle, and legislation, and shared authority). (SBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED136472

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Changing Roles of Special Education Personnel

by

Maynard C. Reynolds,
Director, Leadership Training Institute for
Special Education and Chairman
Department of Psychoeducational Studies
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

EC093192

Introduction

As advocates of the exceptional children of our society, special educators have fulfilled various roles to serve the children placed in their charge. The term "role," as used here, can only be defined as the way special educators function in order to provide education for exceptional children.

One might say that the teaching/learning "problems" of exceptional children define the domain of special education for inquiry, training, and service. To the extent that there are known educational procedures for dealing with the various handicapped problems, for example, teaching braille reading methods to children who cannot see or applying behavior modification techniques to increase "on task" behavior by easily distracted pupils, they are functions. When functions are combined in performance by an individual, a role emerges. Obviously, roles may vary in many ways. In a similar vein, one might say that to the extent that specific teaching functions are known to and can be performed by teachers to solve particular problems, they become teacher "competencies." Combinations of competencies, if they are demonstrated by teachers, presumably are the basis on which roles are defined and individuals are credentialed or certified as special educators.

In a larger sense, one may use the term "role" to define an entire field. This larger usage can be identified in the ensuing discussion of the historical aspects of special education and in some of the projections for the future. The implications for the roles of special education personnel are obvious, even if they are not made explicit. Attention is also given in this paper to the expanding domain in which special educators are expected to serve and to the changing boundary lines between special education and other aspects of education.

This paper is an edited version of one presented to UCEA in June, 1973.

CHANGING ROLES OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL

Page

Introduction 1

Historical Perspective 2
Nineteenth Century: Residential Schools 3
Early Twentieth Century: Community Prototypes . . . 3
1945-1970: Explosion of Simple Models 4
The 1970s: Negotiating for More Inclusive Arrangements 8

Forces and Trends in the 1970s 9
Aggressive Categorical Parent Group 9
Minority Groups 11
Individualism 12
Broadening the Mainstream 15
The Demise of Simple Predictions: A More Open View of Human Capacities 18

A Look for the Future 21
Some Major Problem Areas 21
The Large Cities 21
Funding 22
Private Schools 24
The Distribution Problem 25
Commitment 26
Some Predicted Organizational Restructuring 27
Individual Differences: New Management Systems in Mainstreaming 27
New Relationships with Remedial Specialists . . 27
New Relationships with Programs for the Disadvantaged 28

Changing Roles of Special Education Personnel 29
Special Education as a Support 29
More In-School Child Study 30
More Local Educational Services for the Severely and Profoundly Handicapped 30
Simplified Formal Systems for Professional Standards 31

General Outlook 31

A Personal State of Alternatives and Preferences 33
The Right to Education Principle 33
Legislation 34
A Broader Responsibility 35
Shared Authority 35
Two Broad Alternatives 36

References 37

This paper is organized around three topics: (a) a brief history of special education that leads up to its present status; (b) a discussion of current forces and trends; and (c) a discussion of problems, predictions, and their implications for the future.

Historical Perspective

The history of education for exceptional children, if told from their point of view, is a simple story of massive neglect, denial, and rejection. For every Laura Bridgeman and Helen Keller, tens of thousands of other children with handicaps were doomed to constricted lives because it was believed that they could not be taught or were not worth teaching. In a sense, the development of special education can be recounted as an assault with a handful of dedicated pioneers: Gaspard Itard (1774-1838), and his student Edouard Sequin (1812-1880) who began the study and training of mentally deficient children; Samuel G. Howe (1801-1876), who started the first school for the blind in the United States and proved by his work with blind and deaf Laura Bridgeman that the blind could be educated; Thomas H. Gallaudet (1787-1851), who organized the first school for the deaf in this country; and Louis Braille (1809-1852), the inventor of the system of writing that bears his name.

Formal arrangements for the education of exceptional children in the United States can be divided into four periods as follows:

Rough Time Periods	Modal Programs Format
1. Late 19th Century	Residential School
2. Early 20th Century	Prototype Community-based Programs, the special class and special school
3. About 1945-1970	Explosion of the simple "special class" model
4. Beginning about 1970	Negotiations for more inclusive arrangements: The period of "least restrictive alternative," "mainstreaming," or "progressive inclusion."

Brief reviews of each of the first three periods are given below; thereafter, the main body of the paper deals with new and current trends which appeared rather sharply in the early 1970s and which promise to persist for some period of time.

Nineteenth Century: Residential Schools

The first institutions organized in the United State for the education of blind, deaf, and retarded children were residential; they became the models and set the dominant early pattern for special education in the United States. The institutions tended to be narrowly categorical in orientation and, since colleges and universities were not yet involved in relevant professional training programs, teachers were necessarily prepared for their specialized work by on-the-job training. The roles of teachers, therefore, were defined categorically as of the "blind," the "deaf," or the "retarded."

Although most states established residential schools for the children of residents and numerous private schools were also founded, not all exceptional children could be accommodated in the institutions. The facilities were limited in the state-operated schools and the private ones were too expensive for many families. Some parents considered the removal of their children more onerous than depriving them of educational opportunities. And children with multiple handicaps were often not eligible for admission to any school.

Residential schools are still in existence but more and more they are being used only for selected profoundly handicapped individuals who are thought to be best served there.

Early Twentieth Century: Community Prototypes

Some distinctive community-based programs for the education of exceptional children began to appear at about the turn of the Century as special classes and public day schools. In their earliest forms, these programs were dependent on residential schools for leadership, curriculums, and teacher preparation. Gallaudet College, for example, which was then serving deaf children, started a teacher-training program in the 1890s (Craig, 1942), and in 1904, the Vineland Training School in New Jersey began summer training sessions for teachers of retarded children (Hill, 1945).

At their best, these early community programs never more than tolerated the exceptional children and the movement developed slowly. For the first half of the Twentieth Century, most handicapped children were in schools for minimum periods only. Some children were forced to repeat grades until they became embarrassingly oversized in comparison with their classmates. When "special" classes of "opportunity" rooms were instituted for handicapped children, the labels often took on derogatory connotations.

Until comparatively recently, of course, public schools had never seriously tried to serve all children, and especially not those who were difficult to teach. Indeed, most children attended school long enough to acquire a basic education, during the first decades of this century. Consequently, school systems were not prepared physically, philosophically, or financially to operate far-reaching programs for exceptional children. Special education is costly be definition because of its emphasis on individual problems and needs. When school budgets were limited, as during the Depression of the 1930s in particular, special class programs were not expanded.

The rather pervasive neglect of atypical children which was evident well into the Twentieth Century was perhaps not a deliberate and callous deprivation but, rather, an outgrowth of certain ideas which were pervasive at the time. Sloan (1963) attributed the educational lethargy of the early 1900s to the widespread public misinformation on genetics and criminal tendencies, and to the accepted attitude that mental retardation was generally a hopeless condition. According to Zigler (1969), ideas about the "rigidity" of the retarded, which emerged during the 1930s, tended to become diffused in the public consciousness and to further delay and deny such children opportunities for training. Delay and denial were experienced by most handicapped children of all varieties.

Nevertheless, during the 1920s and 1930s, formal programs to train teachers for the handicapped were instituted in a few universities, first at Wayne University and The Teachers College of Columbia University, and then at Eastern Michigan University at Ypsilanti and the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee. The roles for which teachers were prepared were mainly modeled after teachers of the residential schools.

1945-1970: Explosion of Simple Models

As if to make up through one large effort the neglect of centuries, a remarkable surge of activities in behalf of handicapped

children began shortly after World War II. Our largest states launched programs to serve the handicapped in the public schools on a broad scale and numerous colleges and universities organized programs to train teachers in special education.

The change that occured over the quarter of a century is best reflected in statistics. In 1948, 442,000 children were enrolled in special education programs, in 1963, 1,666,000 (Mackie, 1965), and, according to estimates of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, during the 1971-72 school year, 2,857,551 handicapped children were receiving special education services. These data reflect more than a six-fold increase.

The increase in training programs for teachers of the handicapped was almost as great. About 77 colleges and universities were providing training sequences for special education teachers in one or more categories in 1948; by 1954, the number was 122 (Mackie & Dunn, 1954), and by 1973, over 400. The rapid increases in college programs in the 1950s and 1960s reflected the new involvement of the federal government in support of training efforts in special education. In addition to special education teachers, school systems were employing growing numbers of administrators and supervisors for the rapidly proliferating programs of special education which were spreading across more and more categories of handicaps.

Although it is impossible to determine all the influences which brought about the sudden development of public school programs for exceptional children, three can be recognized. They were new on the educational scene.

1. Parents of handicapped children formed a number of organizations, such as the National Association for Retarded Children* (chartered in 1950), which became socially and politically active. They influenced state legislatures and the Congress. Because of the activities of the politically aggressive parent organizations, the federal government established a national program in the field of special education. In 1957, supports were provided for research and leadership training in the area of mental retardation; in 1963, the supports were extended by Congress to cover virtually all areas of handicaps; and in 1967, the new Bureau of Education for the Handicapped was established to administer the burgeoning new programs.

*Now the National Association for Retarded Citizens

2. Many state legislatures, in response to pressures from parents' groups, passed new legislation that mandated instruction in the schools for many categories of exceptional children. The legislatures provided excess cost aids in one form or another to local school districts that launched new programs. Because of the financial assistance provided by state legislatures, and later by the federal agencies, many school districts found that the operation of special education programs not only permitted the provision of services for exceptional children but also helped to improve the services for the school population as a whole.

3. As the nation became aware of and made necessary provisions for the rehabilitation of World War II and Korean War veterans who had been seriously injured, facilities in Veterans Hospitals were enlarged and new research programs to further aid the veterans were established in various institutions and agencies. In colleges and universities, departments of clinical psychology, speech pathology, and physical medicine were expanded through federal rehabilitation funds and the influences of their investigations in behalf of veterans spread to the research and training being carried on for exceptional children. For example, because blinded veterans rejected isolation and dependency as their fate, programs for mobility and occupational training were begun for them at Veterans Hospitals. Some of the national leaders who participated in carrying out these programs were also involved with schools. Consequently, some transference of expertise took place which was reflected in programmatic developments for blind children. Many school systems found that these children could function in day school programs based on a resource room model, that is, programs in which the children spend only part of the day away from the regular classroom. These programs forced serious examination of the past practices of automatically referring blind children to special schools or classes.

It should be noted that the sheer quantitative leap in programing for exceptional children between 1945 and 1970 cannot be attributed to any great technological or ideological advances. There were some innovations, such as the development of low-vision and individual electronic hearing aids, but they are of limited account in the context of massive change. In the main, the period can be said to have been one of rapid development based on simple models of the past. The teachers who were prepared in the 1950s and 1960s were, in most cases, prepared for "special classes" of the familiar model of earlier decades.

This is not to imply that the two-and-one-half decades were totally barren of new ideas; in fact, some of the trends that are discussed in the next section were generated during these important years. A few examples should suffice.

As part of the studies stimulated by President John F. Kennedy in the mid-1960s, a great many U. S. special educators were enabled to investigate developments in the field in other parts of the world. Visitors to the Scandinavian countries encountered what is known as the process of "normalization," that is, educating the handicapped in and for the "normal" environment of the non-handicapped to the maximum feasible extent. This viewpoint requires major development of community-based support systems for the handicapped.

The boundary lines of the categories of exceptional children began to be seriously examined and strong pressures were developed to extend special education services to children who were obviously very much in need of specialized forms of education but were yet unserved. The case which was argued most strenuously in the 1950s was whether schools should serve the "trainable" as well as the "educable" retarded.[1]

Special education categories were increased to provide services to children who do not fall into any of the traditional special handicap classifications. In the last 1960s, the largest increases in special education enrollments were in the area of "learning disabilities," an area that many observers consider not to be a handicap category in the traditional sense but, rather, a very diverse set of residuals from other categories. The inclusion of the category in special education's province was welcomed by many persons, nevertheless, because it represented a move away from the overly simple medical and psychometric models of categorization, which have increasingly come under attack, and permitted the extension of service to neglected children, even if the definitional problems provided a major professional embarrassment.

Overall, one characteristic of the post-war period may be of the greatest importance for the future: For the first time diverse programs of special education were consolidated in single institutions. For the first time, it became possible to look at and to work across all categories and to consider how they might be related to each other. That consolidation began to be reflected in the research and training programs of many colleges and universities.

---

[1]For the famous debate between I. Ignacy Goldberg and William M. Cruickshank, see the NEA Journal for December, 1958. Recent judicial and legislative mandates relating to the schools' responsibility to all handicapped children have made this debate of historical interest.

During the busy period of the 1960s the long-standing patterns of special education began to draw their share of skepticism and even hostility. Although blessed with rapidly increasing amounts of money, the field did not generate serious evaluation of its programs. When evaluation studies were undertaken, as in the 1960 series of mental retardation special class "efficacy" studies, the evaluation methodology was usually at least as doubtful as the practices purported to be evaluated.

Skeptical attitudes were expressed by some special educators, such as Dunn (1968) and some people outside of the professional ranks. For example, the following comments were offered to a group of special education administrators in 1970 by Congressman Albert Quie:

> One of the great problems of being in political office these days is that there is very little that is sacred. One was generally always safe being for motherhood, the flag, apple pie, and handicapped children. But today with the women's liberation movement and the pill, motherhood is being challenged, the flag seems to be continually getting into trouble, apple pie is being tested by the Food and Drug Administration, and I am afraid that handicapped children might not be too far behind. If the public is going to significantly invest in the education of the exceptional child . . . (it is necessary) . . . to establish clear objectives for the programs, to explain to the public what its dollars will buy, and to demonstrate that the objectives have been achieved. (Quie, 1970)

The 1970s: Negotiating for more Inclusive Arrangements

Most of the remainder of this paper consists of a detailing of the period of the 1970s and a few extrapolations into the future. I believe that quite fundamental changes are in process in the 1970s; they involve a renegotiation of boundaries between regular and special education and between community-based and residential institutions. Perhaps the period can be summarized under the rubric "least restrictive alternative" or "mainstreaming," in a broad meaning, or "progressive inclusion."

But before proceeding beyond the brief historical statement covering the first three periods and leading into the current scene, a brief summary conclusion is in order. The theme in the brief historical sketch above is that the whole history of education for exceptional children can be told in terms of one

steady trend described as "progressive inclusion." Handicapped children have come, in a period of less than two centuries, from total neglect, first into isolated residential schools--for just a few - then into isolated community settings--mostly in the form of special classes--and now into more integrated arrangements for many children. At this moment we are in the midst of what will undoubtedly be recorded in future histories as a remarkable reversal of a negative cascade by which handicapped children were sent off to isolated classes and centers. The agendas of local school boards all across the country in the early 1970s reflect the influx to the community of seriously handicapped children, earlier sent off to hospitals and residential centers; and on the desks of virtually every school principal are difficult questions concerning the accommodation of more exceptional children in regular classrooms.

The current mainstreaming trend is not, I believe, a minor pendulum swing or a temporary enthusiasm. There has been a quite steady, progressive, inclusive trend in special education from the beginning: unconcern —— to distal —— to proximal arrangements. It would be naive simply to assume a straight-line, uncomplicated, and continuing trend; but there are fundamental forces at work, I believe, which support the general trend toward more inclusive arrangements for the education of children who have special needs. Administrative arrangements are seem increasingly as dependent variables, as modifiable to meet individual human needs, rather than as well-designed, impermeable niches for children diagnosed or "carved by nature" to fit a particular slot. These are the topics for what follows.

Forces and Trends in the 1970s

As used here, the term "forces" signifies those influences that relate to special education but are larger in scope and effect than special education itself. They are, essentially a clustering of ideological and social phenomena which energize and define movements in the field of special education. Because they are of critical importance at this time, they should be understood in relation to possible future courses.

Aggressive Categorical Parent Groups

For some two decades now the schools and other institutions serving exceptional children have been goaded to develop their services by organized groups of parents of exceptional children.

Professionals have usually found constructive ways of interacting with these groups to create a broadly coordinated voice in such activities as achieving legislative consideration at state and federal levels, but the professionals never co-opted the associations. Parent groups are the watchdogs of the institutions that serve their children and they are quick to make themselves heard at all levels--school, community, state, and nation--whenever programs appear to be inadequate.

Initially, the associations used their political power. Since about 1970, however, they have turned to the courts as a means of promoting public action. This fact may be more important than any other in accounting for the changes in special education that are now occurring and are likely to continue, at least into the near future. Court actions are here subsumed under the rubric of parent groups because, clearly, the groups are the basic planning and motivating forces behind them. When the leverage provided by the courts recedes, other stratagems will unquestionably be employed to secure changes in policies and programs.

In the context of recent court decisions, "right of education," "right to treatment," "due process," and "least restrictive alternative" have emerged as concepts which may change the face of all education. Although the PARC (Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children)[2] and certain subsequent cases have not yet run their full legal course, either because they were settled by consent arguments among the parties or had not yet been appealed to the Supreme Court for constitutional determination, they have been extraordinarily persuasive in establishing the principle that every child, no matter how seriously handicapped he may be has the right to education. In other words, public schools have the obligation to provide appropriate education for literally all children, either in their own local facilities or by arrangement with other agencies.

These cases also established a very broad concept of education. The appropriate function of public education was decided judicially to be the equipping of handicapped children with "life skills," a principle which goes far beyond the goal of transmitting academic skills. The court also made clear that it considered the enhancement of individual development to be the critical objective of education rather than consideration of the returns society might expect from providing the individual with education.

The PARC case also established the right of parents to participate in major decisions affecting their handicapped children. The State Secretary of Education in Pennsylvania was directed to train "hearing officers" who would be available to conduct proceedings for parents and school representatives of such matters as school placement.

[2]PARC v. Pennsylvania, 334 F. Supp. 1257 (E. D. Pa. 1971).

The court also expressed the preference for placing handicapped children in regular classes with displacements to special classes and special schools requiring extraordinary justification. This "least restrictive alternative" aspect of recent cases portends major changes in the kinds of evidence required for and the basic logic of placement processes. Lacking clear evidence of advantage for each child to be in an alternative setting, the child is required to be served in his regular classroom. The demand for "support systems" working with regular teachers to meet these new imperatives is perfectly predictable.

Another set of cases, developed mainly in the context of institutional placements, established the individual's right to treatment, which was defined as including education. The Wyatt-Stickney case[3] has prompted special interest because it helped to establish the principle that lack of funds is not an acceptable justification for failure to provide treatment; public agencies are required either to raise sufficient funds or to reallocate existing resources to fulfill their treatment responsibilities to patients.

Minority Groups

For the most part, parents groups have drawn their memberships and active participants from among the parents of severely handicapped children. A high proportion of the membership is white, middle-class, and relatively affluent. The programs instigated by the organizations, however, by no means have affected only the severely handicapped children in middle-class neighborhoods. Indeed, the greatest impact of the groups' activities has been felt in urban ghetto schools by minority group children in programs for the educable mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed. These two categories probably carry more stigma than any of the others.

The President's Committee on Retardation (1968) found that children from impoverished and minority group homes are 15 times more likely to diagnosed as retarded than are children from higher income families, and that three-fourths of the nation's mentally retarded are to be found in the isolated and impoverished urban and rural slums. Awareness of the spreading presence of "special classes" in ghetto schools has aroused resentment and resistance. As a result, administrators of school systems in our largest cities are under a virtual mandate to reverse the expansion of special education programs and to eliminate the testing, categorizing, and labeling practices which are associated with placement in the programs. In his review of Michael Young's book, Rise of Meritocracy,

[3]Wyatt v. Aderholt, 334 F. Supp. 1341 (M. D. Alabama, 1971).

David Riesman (1967) lauded this kind of "resistance of parents to having their children fall like brass in Plato's social system" (p. 905).

In associations of professionals, such as The Council for Exceptional Children, minority group members have also voice their concern for the "institutionalized racism" represented in excessive allocations of minority group children to programs that remove them from the mainstream of education, and they are working within their associations for changes in the policies and operations of the schools. In fact, there is a rising and very broad demand among special educators for the elimination of any activities that degrade and stigmatize children. The minority groups and professionals who challenge the excesses of special placements and the simple categorizing and labeling of children have taken a position that is, in fact, discordant with the strictly handicapping categories or concepts on which parents' groups are organized.

While associations of parents of handicapped children are seeking to expand the services of special education for their children, minority group members are tending to take strongly negative attitudes toward almost every activity conducted in the name of special education. The opposition is particularly a problem in our largest cities where Civil Rights officers of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare have ordered the desegregation of schools, often with special directives relating to special education classes. A major problem for the immediate future is to find the means by which the energies of both the parents of the handicapped and of ethnic minority children can be joined in support of developments which serve all children with appropriate and good effect.

Individualism

Most states have long-standing laws requiring local school districts to provide education for all children and to compel all children of certain ages to attend the schools provided. Nevertheless, the the past, there have been many instances in which various categories of children have been excused or excluded from the schools. Indeed, many school authorities felt quite free to expel for any reason individual students who were troublesome or difficult. Few communities noted that the so-called compulsory school attendance laws were generally not being administered with vigor and, outside of the immediate families, the demissions of children went largely unnoticed also. The situation was such that in most communities no one really knew how many children were out of school. In large cities, where the mobility of families is high, the situation was even more difficult to assess.

Radical changes have been occurring, however, in part because of the activities of students themselves. They have become increasingly aware of their rights not to be denied valuable educational opportunities by arbitrary procedures. Lawyers, often supported by organized civil libertarians, have been eager to press cases for individual students, and professionals who, from various points of view, see the rights of individual students as a fundamental democratic right that surpasses in importance all rights and conveniences of institutions, have added their weight. In addition, support has been given by legislators who have removed categorical bases for the demission of children from schools, such as the repeal of laws allowing the exclusion of the "trainable" retarded, and thus forced the schools to deliberate each proposed admission or demission on an individual basis. These elements of social action have been epitomized at the Harvard Center for Law and Education from which flow "packages" of legal materials, publications, and services in behalf of individual student rights.

The results of these activities are self-evident. Educators are increasingly enjoined not only to enroll all children who are presented to the schools but to actively seek out all children, including those with special needs, and assure their enrollment in appropriate school programs. Categorical exclusions are rapidly being eliminated by legislative enactments, thus achieving the same results as the broad and binding application of court decisions. The difficult problems of individual pupils are accorded due process in all demission actions; if demission from the school is directed, special arrangements for out-of-school education are provided. The effect of this observance is to harden compulsory attendance laws, to safeguard at the highest levels the right of each student to appropriate education and to add force for reorganization of the schools so individual needs become a paramount concern.

Implicit in this movement is the concept that the rights of the individual have primacy over institutional and even societal concerns and values. There have been times, not long past, when it was argued that exceptional children need not be served by the schools when their returns to society would be minimal. In the Goldberg-Cruickshank debate, for example, Cruickshank argued that "Public education is . . . based on the belief that as a result of learning, the individual will be able to assume a self-directed role in society, and that he will probably assume responsibility for others--his wife and children or parents" (Goldberg-Cruickshank, 1958). It has become increasingly clear, since then, that the ability or potentiality of the individual to provide a return to society or to particular institutions is not a proper test in considering a child's enrollment in school. Even if all that can be anticipated is enhancement of his own life, it is sufficient.

The Council for Exceptional Children, in a 1971 Policy Statement,[4] defined the principle of education as

> . . . the philosophical premise of democracy that every person is valuable in his own right and should be afforded equal opportunities to develop his full potential. Thus, no democratic society should deny educational opportunities to any child, regardless of his potentialities for making a contribution to society.

The emergence of priority for the individual and the measurement of programs in terms of return to the individual rather than to public purposes is undergirded by fundamental work in some professional areas. New approaches to measurement and evaluation which are oriented to the individual, as in applied behavior analysis, are having expanded effects. Procedures for criterion- and domain-referenced testing which link testing closely with instruction and make little use of social-comparison types or norm-referencing tests are having strong impact on education, particularly in programs for atypical pupils. Increasing number of journals now tend to accept studies based on N=1. New management systems, such as Individually Guided Education (IGE), give teachers new tools for bringing attention to the individual student. Curriculums stress adaptations to individuals, as in Individual Prescribed Instruction (IPI) and innumerable systems for computerized assistance in instruction. The applied behavior analysts, who work in the schools, following principles developed by Skinner, Bijou, Lindsley, Haring, and others, give preeminent position to data on and instruction for the individual.

Spears' (1973) opinion survey of Phi Delta Kappa members distinctly showed positive feelings toward and predictions on topics covering individualization. For example, 87% of his respondents agreed that IGE has a potential to improve education; 74% agreed that IPI has the same potential; and 75% agreed that Individual Mathematics System (IMS) also has such a potential. The extent of agreement of these items was higher than on most others in the survey.

There can be no question that the new focus on the individual student reflects altered values as well as practices and that they portend fundamental changes in the schools.

---

[4]Basic Commitments and Responsibilities to Exceptional Children. Reston, Va: CEC, 1971.

Broadening the Mainstream

A number of observers have long believed that they busy period of expansion of special education subsequent to World War II was, in fact, a sad example of special educators' complicity in perpetuating the rejection of children from mainstream educational structures and in attaching "child-blaming" labels on exceptional children. According the argument raised, deviancy labels are given to children who are difficult or inconvenient to teach and, thus, they can be removed from the mainstream and isolated in special classes. It is a parallel of the criticism by Szasz (1961) of society's treatment of people who are different.

If one takes a limited view of schools during the period in question, the argument against special educators may be valid. However, the critics may overlook the fact that for the first time in the history of education, stations for exceptional children were built into the schools, making them a part of the total school community. Educators who take this point of view believe that the rapid expansion of special education in the schools, even in a largely "set aside" form, was a necessary transition to the more complete integration of exceptional children into the regular school structures. The schools of the nation had never been prepared to serve all children and it would have expected too much to move in one simple step to a broadly inclusive mainstream system.

The discussion of "mainstreaming" by special educators has become somewhat academic since the trend is a broad one, noticeable in many fields of human service, especially in mental health and social welfare, and in such fields as architecture and public transportation. Organized groups of the handicapped themselves, along with many professional allies, are demanding that the accommodative capacity of mainstream structures be expanded and that the tendencies to isolate the handicapped be reversed. In the field of mental health, the rapid development of community psychiatry and psychology epitomized the mainstreaming effort. Where, in past years, large numbers of therapists served individual patients in isolated clinics and hospitals, how therapeutic help is given to troubled persons through the development of support systems and services at the community level. Dr. Gerald Caplan, Director of the Harvard Laboratory of Community Psychiatry, illustrated the trend in his call" . . . for the community psychiatrist to start by getting firsthand knowledge of a problem through diagnosing the treating emotionally disturbed individuals; then he should become a consultant and educator to enable other caregivers to handle such cases; later, he should consult with organizations so that they may develop policies and programs for the prevention and control of these disorders . . ." (Caplan, 1972).

An assumption in the mainstreaming movement is that "much of what we consider to be mental disorder is both socially determined and defined. The major faculty of society lie not with its people but in its systems, and this premise is basic" (Dorken, 1971). That theme has perhaps been most fully developed by Szasz (1961), who argued with growing force and effect that the first tendency of society is to reject those who are different and that this tendency can and must be altered.

A different argument for the development of community psychiatry and psychology can be read in the position of Albee (1959). He points out some years ago that the helping professions simply could not expect to grow sufficiently to meet all the therapeutic needs of the population through the individual treatment mode.

Each of the arguments raised in the field of mental health has been paralleled in the field of special education. Trippe (1971) has argued the social determiner position. Gallagher (1968) has demonstrated that "we can't get there from here," that is, that we will not be able to supply the needed specialized teachers for major categories of exceptional children for at least the foreseeable future if we proceed by our present modes. The fact is, of course, that many children with special needs now sit in regular classrooms with less attention and help than they need. Indeed, in many communities we have become all too complacent about students who sit it out in classrooms to which they are confined but which offer them nothing or worse. One of the gains to be hoped for in the mainstreaming trend is that all of these students will come to the forefront for attention and that program revisions directed to their service will be initited.

Supports are also being rapidly developed in the informal care-giving network of communities which make it possible for exceptional persons to remain in the community. Parent groups, churches, 4-H groups, bowling leagues, summer camps, and similar groups form this informal network. The wide-ranging social actions in the community provide a framework of reference and support for mainstreaming in the schools.

Mainstreaming is rapidly becoming the single most conspicuous trend in the field of education. In a recent open-ended survey conducted by the writer for The Council for Exceptional Children, special educators were asked to list the changes that they anticipated in the field for the next decade. Mainstreaming was listed more often than any other single topic. Although the specific predictions took a variety of forms, the central element

of each was that children with exceptional needs will be referred less often out of regular classes for treatment in special classes and centers. The action required for this change to be successful will be mainly in the area of the regular classroom, making it a broader, more flexible and resourceful place.

Where the mainstreaming movement is taken seriously, attention is given to a number of implications. One is that regular classroom teachers need training and assistance to become more resourceful in accommodating exceptional pupil. This idea is not new. Wallin, in 1935, reported that " . . . for countless generations the public school education of handicapped and maladjusted children . . . has been squarely placed upon the regular grade teacher, although they have never been required to qualify for this . . . work by earning one credit in appropriate courses." Lately, many college faculty and local supervisors have begun to take seriously the matter of better and broader preparation of regular educators, and several states have mandated courses on exceptionality for all teachers.

A correlative actvity is the rapid change-over of many special education teacher-preparation programs to provide broadly trained resource or consulting teachers who can help to bridge gaps between regular and special education. A collection of papers on such programs (Deno, 1973) describes some dozen different models in which new kinds of personnel and new systems are being used to bring regular and special education into one total system to serve all children. The Deno monograph and an earlier on edited by Reynolds and Davis (1971), focus on the specific efforts by one bureau of the U. S. Office of Education to support mainstreaming forms of special education. Similar developments have been encouraged by the bloc grant procedures of the Training Division of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped of the U. S. Office of Education, which were made available as alternatives to categorical grants for training purposes, beginning in 1971.

Many special educators now think of their field as involving a broad continuum or cascade of administrative and instructional arrangements, ranging from regular class placements to resource room plans, itinerant teaching plans, part-time special classes, full-time special classes, local day schools, residential schools, treatment centers, and hospitals. In the past exceptional children tended to be "rejected" to special stations with the most seriously handicapped rejected down through all levels to the end-of-the-line residential centers. What clearly is happening now is that the negative cascade is reversing along the whole continuum. Institutions are emptying back to the community and special stations back to regular classes. At its worst, this trend is a cruelty if no decent arrangements are made to retrain personnel and reorder programs; at its best, the trend permits the thrilling

discovering of how the mainstream schools can indeed accommodate many exceptional pupils and become part of broad community support structures for the children who have special needs. This involves the making of the mainstream classroom into something broader than it has been in the past and new supportive roles for many special educators.

The Demise of Simple Predictions: A More Open View of Human Capacities

A variety of particular events can perhaps be best summarized under the theme of an emerging openness toward or more optimistic view of human capacities. The pervasive pessimism about some exceptional pupils, which existed for the first half o. the Twentieth Century and seemed to be derived in part from notions on testing and prediction, has started to disappear.

Binet's original task in the schools of Paris at about the turn of the century was to develop a means of predicting the school achievement of children; he succeeded remarkably well, at least as compared with the general validity level of most other forms of psychological prediction. The ideas of prediction and capacity were quickly linked. The predicted level of academic progress was all to quickly interpreted as a statement of the pupil's "capacity" to function in a given course. The linkage of simple prediction and capacity was taken for granted. For at least half a century almost as much energy went into academic prediction and evaluation of children's "capacities" as into the prediction of horse races and the stock market.

An early side effect of the academic prediction movement, whoch mostly used general intelligence test results as the predictors, was the development of individualized grading systems. It became a matter of misguided fairness that some children should be expected to achieve more and some less and that their school report cards should reflect each child's achievement in relation to his individual capacity.

A refinement of this procedure was the special attention given to those children whose capacity was high but achievements were low--the so-called underachievers. Somehow, children achieving "below capacity" were made a special clinical group. It might equally have been argued that all children were doing exactly as should be expected of them if only we knew enough to make accurate predictions. In any case, the discrepancy cases might have been called the "overpredicted," putting the onus on

the psychologists, rather than the "underachievers," which put the onus on the child. Discrepancies between mental age and achievement age are not indications of special aptitude for better work, but millions of dollars were invested in support of the assumption.

Strangely, these discrepancy variables, reflecting differences between capacity and achievement, have never been carefully studied although they have been enormously popular in drawing distinctions between remedial or learning disability cases and the retarded. The assumption was that children with high capacity but low achievement belonged to a different category than those showing uniformly low, flat profiles, and there was a pervasive pessimism about the educability of children with low capacity estimates. No wonder parents of EMR children became hostile toward schools!

A subtle form of discrepancy analysis, using profile interpretations, involved the assumption that the general level of a profile yields some kind of capacity or expectancy level, and that departures from the flat median line represent needs and potentialities for remediation. By some mystical process, the average of several scores becomes the "expected" level on each variable and presumably flat profiles are preferred over irregular ones. This form of discrepancy analysis will stand up to rigorous examination no better than simpler approaches using general intelligence as the standard. A particular problem with many profile procedures is that reliability is low on some scales, so that a proper use of regressed profile scores would sometimes turn a profile on its head.

Lately, a variety of forces has broken the rigid molds of past notions. Scholars, reexamining studies on the nature-nurture controversy, have helped to create a much more open idea of the nurturance of intelligence (Hunt, 1961), and studies in international education have helped to clarify the great influence of social forces in the achievements of individual human beings (Halsey, 1961). In addition, minority groups have militantly demanded a more guarded use of general intelligence tests.

B. F. Skinner has argued that we have permitted the adjective, as in intelligent behavior, to become the noun intelligence, and then made futile speculations about its determinants. Bijou and others, who have urged the educational community to adopt the viewpoint of the applied behavior analyst, have argued that "a retarded individual is one who has a limited repertory of behavior evolving from interactions with his environmental contacts which constitute his history" (Bijou, 1963).

In this framework a concept of general capacity seems to be superfluous. Ogden Lindsley took what might be the ultimate position when he wrote.

> Children are not retarded, only their behavior in average environments is sometimes retarded. In fact, it is modern sciences' ability to design suitable environments for these children that is retarded. (Lindsley, 1964, p. 62)

McClelland has classed the behaviorists with missionaries in that both believe behavior can be changed if the response is defined carefully and the environment is controlled to influence the probabilities of response.

The sources of new viewpoints on human capacity are many, but suffice it to say that views are much less fixed now than they were earlier. What might be expected of a person is seen, in important part, to be a function of his culture and of his particular environmental history. It is increasingly appreciated also that "intelligent" behavior has many noncognitive determinants. Classifications of individuals according to simple intelligence test results or other capacity estimates are not so secure; and classifications according to discrepancy systems involving differences between capacity and achievements are tenuous, indeed. In this context, consequently, specific doubts and embarrassments inevitably arise over such classifications as "retarded," "underachiever," "remedial case," and "learning disabled." Such classifications have little valid use in making instructional decisions.

The implications of changing views on human capacities include the making of early childhood education, particularly in disadvantaged communities, a primary target for action. A second territory of rapid change in this context is in school testing, where the new emphasis is on domain or criterion-referenced tests and achievement monitoring systems which are more directly interpretable and relevant to instruction rather than norm-referenced tests. A related territory of expanding interest in evaluation, which is yielding new tools for studying programs or the instructional environment as an adjunct to studies of individual children. As attention goes to studying the child's life situation, as well as the child himself, school psychologists and kindred workers will need insights and skills which few possess at this time.

Although yet in its infancy, the concept of Aptitude-Treatment-Interations (ATI) is extremely promising as a way of looking at the varieties of capacities of individuals, depending upon the

varieties of treatments to which they are subjected. Indeed, the field of special education exists on the assumption of something like ATI; that is, that individuals do differ in the kinds of educational programs best suited to them and that it is possible to observe characteristics of individuals (aptitudes) in such a way as to "match" them with the most promising approaches (i.e., instructional programs or other aspects of environment) for each person. The ATI concept, in a sense, represents a philosophy as well as a technical approach to the study of learners and learning environments. The view stresses the making of decisions which are optimal rather than straightforward estimations of how much of some attribute an individual has. As this orientation is achieved it should help to take much of the onus off psychologists who, in their measurement functions, too often have been simply labelers, measurers and predictors rather than responsible decision makers.

A Look to the Future

On the basis of the brief outlines of the history of special education and of some of the forces and trends in the field, it may be appropriate to consider our agenda for the future. My orientation here is only mildly proactive; others will wish to project more radical ventures and describe more distant landscapes. For myself, contemplation of even the relatively near problems and challenges turns out to be a difficult and almost forbidding exercise.

Some Major Problem Areas

Perhaps a suitable starting point is a few of the areas in which trends and forces conflict and deep difficulties appear to be imminent.

The Large Cities. The 23 largest cities* enroll somewhat over ten percent of the children of the nation in public schools. These same cities have 30 percent of the children who qualify as disadvantaged (as defined in certain U. S. Office of Education programs). The lives of many children in the cities are in disorder, especially the high proportion from minority groups (black, chicano, Indian). Minority group children are placed in special classes for the educable mentally retarded at two to four times

*In 1973, there were 23 city members of the Council of Great Cities.

the rate for such placement of white children. Special education has been used, more often than not, as a place to isolate disorderly children so that order can be kept in regular programs, rather than as a distinctly specialized education center for carefully placed children. Minority group parents and professionals are rebelling against special placements and the resultant negative labels and they are insisting on integrated programming for their children. But if difficult children are returned in large numbers from special education to regular classes, the teachers will resist unless the most useful and supportive arrangements are made.

It would be desirable to undertake massive new programs to individualize instruction along with the use of special education personnel in support of regular programs, but funds and other resources needed for change—leadership, vitality, commitment, trainers—are usually lacking. Indeed, the largest cities are those with the most serious financial problems and most likely to reduce educational expenditures. They have relatively little capacity at this time to mount the desirable retraining and support systems. In the meantime, residential institutions for children who are mentally ill, retarded, or adjudicated delinquent are being emptied and the receivers, in the main, are the large cities.

There is little doubt that we have crowded a large proportion of children with problems into large urban centers which themselves seem to be in disorder and which, in turn, magnify the disorder in the lives of children. These children have too few stable and constructive supports in their lives. They and their life situations provide the focus toward which special educators ought to rally their best resources. But the fact is that, so far, many state departments of education and institutions of higher education are operated as if they were largely unaware of the distinct and massive problems of special education in the cities. There are a few signs that the cities themselves may organize new forces with which to "bootstrap" their own repairs (Reynolds, 1975), but mostly the future looks difficult, indeed, for special education and for all of education in many of the big cities.

Funding. Always a problem, the funding of specialized school programs looms now as a larger and, to some extent, new challenge. The courts are ordering new developments for special education but the courts have no money to provide, only power to direct. And, not surprisingly, many State legislatures and the Congress seem reluctant to change their agendas and budgets at the behest of the courts. There is some rhetoric about "full service goals" but the tendency is for the idea to fade somewhere in the political interval between authorizations and appropriations. The result of

all this is that special educators have directives for new programs just as fund raising has become a severe problem and, therefore, they are forced into the position of arguing for the reallocation of insufficient local funds.

State and local authorities appear to be in the mood to hold down taxes, even though it means slighting the needs of special education along with other aspects of education, because votes against the handicapped are no longer political suicide. It is a great difficulty for school leaders in many states and a cruelty to many children that as institutions for the mentally ill and retarded are being emptied back to the communities, corresponding action to shift funds to the local schools, which must bear the brunt of the exodus, are not being taken.

Another very great difficulty is that as programs emerge for the integration of special education with mainstream programs, as interchanges of children between specialized and regular school elements are being developed, the eligibility of the schools for state special education financial aids frequently becomes uncertain, that is, in many States the special categorical aids are available only when specific children have been labeled and placed into specialized programs other than the regular classroom. If the handicapped student is served in a broadened mainstream without being labeled as retarded or disturbed, it is often at the financial disadvantage to the local district. Preschool programs seldom involve "set-aside" stations for exceptional children and, thus, seldom qualify for categorical special education aids. This introduces a most unfortunate deterrent into the school situation where school leaders may wish to accommodate handicapped children but are rewarded for doing so only in isolated program formats.

To a degree, special education now suffers the same problem as health; often public monies or insurance programs will cover costs in the hospital (or special class) but not if you stay in the mainstream and tend carefully to your health (and education) there. Thus we find people being sent to hospitals and children to special classes and special schools because that is the way to get money for program support. Our policies on program and on funding are at cross-purposes. Repair of the difficulty in the case of special education is likely to be very difficult because the basic unit for "payoff," the unit which triggers the dollar flow in most states, is the individual child labeled-in-category and placed in a special program. That approach, I believe, is not viable for much longer and will need to be replaced by funding systems that deal with a different unit.

If the field is to develop a broad continuum of services, many of them not involving the categorization of mild and moderately

handicapped children in traditional niches, it will be necessary to define new units for documenting the work of special educators. Part of the answer may lie in shifting the emphasis to the specialized teacher or other professional worker as the basic reimbursement unit and permitting him/her to be employed in whatever ways will enhance the opportunities for children with exceptional needs. An alternative procedure would be to fund broadly framed programs or major program elements which would be justified through evaluation efforts. Examples of these alternatives are beginning to emerge in several states. In any case, the definition, dissemination, and acceptance of new units, other than child-in-category, is likely to be a major challenge to special education for some time.

A subtle but potentially devastating funding problem is the general loss in recent years of development funds. The Education Professions Development Act, for example, which in the late 1960s and early 1970s, provided federal funds to support innovative training models and, indirectly, new service models, has been stripped of its authorization and resources. In the long run, this lack of development funds will impose severe limitations on the generation of new concepts and leadership in special education.

A fundamental funding question, of course, concerns just what proportion of the total child population shall be the concern of special educators. The parallel question concerns just how much the public is willing to buy under the special education rubric. At this time the common percentage claimed for "handicapped" is about ten to twelve percent of the total child population. But some persons would stretch that to a much large percentage; others would have the field contract and dedicate itself to only the most severely handicapped, perhaps aggregating to only four or five percent of the general child population. My assumption is that at least for the near future the field of special education, in addition to taking clear and definite leadership in providing programs for the severely handicapped, will need to supply a large portion of the energies, commitment, and skills necessary to serve the mildly and moderately handicapped. It is mainly in the latter aspect of the special education mission that new relationships with regular education must be negotiated.

Private Schools. One convenient way for local schools to comply with "right to education" directives is to send difficult children to private schools. It creates no programmatic disturbances at local levels. Yet it is beset with many difficulties, chief among which is an unfortunate removal of the children from home and community supports. If the movement is large in this direction, costs can be enormous, as they now are in several states, and political forces can develop which place the whole special education scene out of control. Powerful, well-meaning advocates

for private schools might easily use their resources to build a new private school system in the nation and, in the process, deprive the local day schools of the energies and resources necessary to develop broad and effective programs for exceptional children.

Sometimes a special version of the medical model emerges in which psychiatrists or other non-educational specialists virtually control referral and admissions to private schools. The whole system can be turned to the advantage of relatively affluent families--those who can secure private diagnoses and maneuver through the necessary steps of referral and placement. There is evidence, in some places, that public payments for expensive private schools tend to be one way of preserving racial segregation.

Exceptional children need all the help they can get and some of it appropriately comes from the private sector. There are excellent private schools and many other forms of private contributions to the education of exceptional children. There is a great need to make visible examples of healthy interaction between public and private programs for exceptional children. But, equally, unhealthy operations and trends need to be made visible and to be opposed.

The Distribution Problem. Special education services have always been maldistributed, but never so obviously as now when courts direct that all children be served. One key facet of the distribution problem is that specialists tend not to go to certain high-need areas for employment. For example, it is difficult to place highly trained teachers of braille and of mobility in rural areas where they may be needed to serve only a small number of widely scattered visually handicapped children and where a major portion of the specialist's time is spent in travelling. Somehow, better methods of recruitment, placement and utilization for specialized personnel must be found so that the obligation to serve children in normal environments can be realized, even for those in remote and rural environments. The major implementing changes in this domain may have to occur in the colleges; somehow they need to direct their training efforts to people who will serve where they are most needed.

One possible solution would be for federal and state officials to organize a hierarchical system in which personnel needs would be specified for whole states or broad regions; then the corresponding training functions would be allocated to institutions of higher education. Recruitment, training and placement of trainees would

be monitored and evaluated according to satisfaction of distribution needs, including those in rural areas and other places of specific need. There are some signs of movement that way, through the encouragement of programs of voluntary coordination by colleges and state departments of education which are reviewed by federal officers before training grants are awarded.

A different approach would be to shift some of the training funds which now go to colleges to local schools and agencies according to their needs, permitting them to purchase training. It might be assumed that they would recruit, select, and support for training indigenous teacher-candidates, those who are firmly committed to return with their specialized skills to the communities sponsoring them. Another probable effect would be to draw training resources of the colleges out to communities where they are needed for on-the-job training; this plan would force more "exportability" and packaging into college training departments of special education.

Commitment. Many persons who are in strong positions to influence education are doubtful of some of the emerging principles and practices of special education. For example, some school administrators do not bend easily to the ideology represented in the "right to education" principle. Teachers' associations and unions are not always enthusiastic about the mainstreaming trend in school and community life, probably because it involves fewer referrals out of and the return of some exceptional children to regular classes, which is viewed as a threat of disorder and deterioration in the learning environment for other pupils. Minority group parents are often skeptical of special education in any form.

Part of the answer may come with the awareness of everyone concerned that there are many promising new models by which special education can serve profoundly handicapped children in community settings and by which special educators can come into a closer partnership with the regular school system to create improved learning environments for all children. Beyond awareness, demonstrations of new practices and retraining programs are essential. With such efforts, there undoubtedly can be progress in winning commitment to the necessary developments, although the problem is large and formidable. Hopefully, special educators will give careful attention to problems of evaluation so that the deliberations about the formatting of special education programs can be as informed as possible. Somehow, leading general administrators and lay leaders, such as members of boards of education, need to be persuaded that the trends cited in this report--those involving services to severely handicapped children and those relating to the integration of and better services to exceptional children, within regular programs--are ethically and practically as well as judicially right and feasible.

Some Predicted Organizational Restructuring

One might predict that the turbulence of the times will and should result in some restructuring of schools and of professional organizations. To some extent, restructuring is a matter of revising concepts, but it must extend also to revising formal organizations of educators and to changes in basic legislation. Four areas of such anticipated change must be considered.

Individual Differences: New Management Systems in Mainstreaming. There is a rapidly accelerating movement in the schools to individualize instruction. In part, this movement derives from technological developments, such as domain and criterion-referenced testing, applied behavior analysis, individually oriented classroom manageemnt systems, computer-assisted instruction, and task analysis. "Individual Differences" (IDs) as an emerging concept of the 1970s is very different from the "IDs" that were known only a decade ago. The latter is mostly descriptive of inter-individual differences as revealed through norm-referenced procedures. The new IDs are related to the instruction of pupils as individuals, and little attention is given to group norms.

In a sense, special education is a second force toward the individualization of instruction (the other is the ID movement itself): when a confluence of the two streams--special education and ID--is achieved, schools tend to change very rapidly. It is occurring now with increasing frequency; for example, in Texas, new regional agencies have helped to lead the way by providing support to local schools that are engaged in the reformation of special education* along with the installation of broad systems for the individualization of instruction.

It must be hoped that the ID and special education forces will converge in increasing numbers of situations. It will require exploratory and amalgamation efforts in agencies and schools and, perhaps, especially in colleges and universities. Special education will turn out to be quite a different structure and service wherever it joins in this changing scene.

New Relationship with Remedial Specialists. In recent years many of the long-standing programs of remedial reading have come over to special education under a learning disabilities banner, partly, one might suspect, because there has been more money on the special education side. Distinctions to the point of complete disjunction are sometimes made between such fields as remedial reading and learning disability but they seem tortured and destined for short life.

*To implement the Texas "Plan A."

Congressman Quie introduced in the Congress (1970) a proposal to fund special programs for children who score low on criterion-referenced tests in basic academic skills. No categorical distinctions were proposed, that is, it would not matter whether the low-scoring child is EMR, a remedial case, or learning disabled. Only the child's progress in basic skills would determine eligibility. That kind of action on a broader front seems a promising step. Divisions of children into categories depending upon notions of "process disorders," as is sometimes said to be the problem of learning disabled children, or on patterns of discrepancy analysis, as in defining the remedial case, just are not holding up. Each child would be subject to careful individual study, but classification in the traditional special education categories would be by-passed simply because such classification is not useful, indeed wasteful.

Movements toward this broader approach may be accelerated as colleges move out of their traditional departmental structures and organize on a problems base. Such a movement appears to be accelerating. The marked downturn in demands for regular school personnel in the past three years has forced self-consciousness among teacher educators and a drive for re-organization upon many colleges of education. We can guess that the fragile distinction between remedial work and learning disabilities will not hold up in such re-organizations.

Organizations such as The Council for Exceptional Children and the International Reading Association might well begin looking for bridges, and similar new affinities ought to be developed across relevant offices in state departments of education.

New Relationships with Programs for the "Disadvantaged." The negative attitudes toward special education in the urban ghettos is not a revulsion against specialized school programs--indeed, there is demand for more specialized programs that focus on basic needs of children--but an intolerance for simplistic and degrading labeling systems and what appears to be the isolation and rejection of many minority group children.

If and when special educators join up with advocates of broad systems for the individualizing of instruction in basic skills, they will be accepted and will have a useful place in the school programs for children of the poor and disadvantaged. This process will be accelerated to the extent that special educators seek counsel and mutual assistance with leaders in minority group education and direct themselves with a sense of high urgency to the problems of urban education.

Special educators have had an awkward time since 1965 in clarifying how they wish to relate to programs under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, in part because it was felt necessary to distinguish specialized programs for the handicapped from those serving "other" children. Again, the kind of simple, straightforward proposal offered by Congressman Quie--to support improved education for children whose learning is not progressing adequately--seems refreshing and right. Ultimately, he has proposed, the distinction between Title I and special education programs ought to be--and will be--blurred if not eliminated. In the individual school building, the distinction between Title I staffs and special education staffs--and of many other narrowly categorical programs, each of them with separate administrative staffs and regulations at state and federal levels, has created a veritable jungle of problems. It seems inevitable that forces for unification of many of these programs along the lines of the broader theme of serving the individual needs of each child will force important amalgamations among the various categorical programs.

Changing Roles of Special Education Personnel

Most attention in this paper, so far, has gone to the general changes in the domain of special education. All such discussion is relevant to roles of special educators, at least in the sense of indicating the changing external and internal boundaries within which roles are defined. But it may be well to focus somewhat more systematically and specifically on the topic of roles.

Special Education As A Support System. It appears already to be the case now and a likely persisting trend that more special education teachers will go into what might be called support roles, that is, teaming up with regular teachers rather than operating largely in spearate classes, schools, and centers. Some of the implications of this change are that

- special education personnel will be less identified with categories of exceptionality.
- regular teachers will, both through formal training and work experience with special educators, become more knowledgeable and resourceful in dealing with exceptional pupils.
- special education personnel will be selected and prepared for more indirect influences in the schools, as in consultation and change agent roles.

- major restructuring will occur in the college training programs for special education personnel, becoming less categorized and more integral with general teacher preparation.

More In-School Child Study. It may be predicted that traditional methods of referring children to specialists for diagnosis will decline in practice and, instead, a diagnostic capacity will be built within individual school buildings. Some of the implications of such a change, with special reference to personnel roles, are that

- more dependence will be placed upon diagnosis by teams of regular school personnel, including school principals, special and regular teachers, and others who also carry responsibility for follow-through instruction.
- demise of the "waiting lists" for child study in special centers will follow.
- more study of the child's school and total life situation as an adjunct to direct assessment of the child must occur.
- more continuing involvement of parents in studying children and in making programmatic decisions is inevitable.
- broad integration of diagnostic functions within the school into learning centers, which may also include instructional materials and the library, will increase.
- more use of specialists such as psychologists in indirect roles as trainers and consultants to individual school-based personnel, will be seen.
- much less simple categorizing of and prediction for children, and more explicit orientation to the planning and evluation fo instruction, will be encouraged.
- more effects on total school atmosphere as programs for exceptional children are integrated will be seen.

More local educational services for the severely and profoundly handicapped. It is already the case that many severely handicapped children are being returned from institutions and hospitals to the community for education. Implications are

- rising demand for teachers prepared to deal with severely and profoundly handicapped students.
- new demands for paraprofessionals who can serve in supportive roles in service to the severely handicapped.
- increasing attention to complex problems of diagnosis as in distinguishing problems of autism, retardation and deafness.
- more use of non-traditional personnel (such as psychologists) in instructional roles.
- much close coordination of school and home programs through parental consultation.

Simplified Formal Systems for Professional Standards. If, as anticipated here, boundary lines of the field of special education are destined to change and show more overlap with other areas, such as remedial and disadvantaged programs, along with strong decategorization of internal structures, a variety of implications may be foreseen, such as

- a reduction in the number of different kinds of special education certificates.
- more individualized responsibility by special educators to document their own competencies and performances.
- more active participation in expanding programs of continuing education as a means of enhancing professional development and performance.

General Outlook

Trying to consider the total complex of forces and trends of the moment, their possible development in the near future, and the capacity of the field to respond, what can one anticipate with respect to the general quality of the developments? It appears to this writer that we must expect great unevenness in developments during the next few years.

There are situations in which special educators of great vitality are leading the way in the reformation of schools to the end that all children, even those with major exceptionalities, are accommodated with good effect. In such communities, right to education, due process, and least restrictive alternative are welcomed as useful concepts and forces. But in other places

special educators are buried in ideas and practices of a decade ago and they are fighting against the pressures for change.

Similarly, in some states leadership and funding patterns are being stretched to help build new programs to serve all children; but in others, old rules are observed all the more diligently as bulwarks against change.

It seems likely that more innovative and progressive special educators will have the greater influence with general educators. Such influence is critical to developments of this period. It is noteworthy that the rash of court orders of this period is going not to special educators but to general education officers and what these orders direct is broad change in schools, not just in-house special education changes.

Integration of special education into very broad base planning is occurring in many states where new super-departments of human services--or departments with similar titles--are being formed. Federally supported programs for the "developmentally disabled" have been particularly strong in cross-department, cross-disciplinary approaches to human services and they tend to have strong impact at planning levels in ways that effect special education. Educators who wish to protect special education as a set of mainly categorical, clinical operations, will have but little impact in these major new conglomerates.

A disappointing aspect of the general outlook is that there is little fundamental energy spent on and so few really compelling ideas relating to gifted children. Following Sputnik, interest surged in assuring high supplies of brain power to societally essential functions--as seen from a kind of nationally defensive position. Research on creative thinking has shown promise and expanded some awareness, but there are not yet the kinds of fundamental stirrings necessary to generate needed programs for the gifted.

One of the emerging ideas and structures of some promise concerns what might be called technical assistance or support systems at a national level. What hope there is in the area of education for the gifted may well depend upon the success of a U. S. Office of Education-supported Leadership Training Institute (LTI) in that field. The LTI has the mission of mobilizing systematic supports from across the nation for educators who try to improve programs for the gifted. Similar national assistance systems have been created in the fields of early education for the handicapped, learning disabilities, and programs in regular schools for exceptional pupils. The attitudes as well as the

specific activities of these programs, which stress the rallying of support to schools trying the serve exceptional children, are extremely important.

If the basic premise of this paper is correct--that special education is in the process of a major transformation which can be characterized as moving into an integrated place in education--the, above all else, support should be provided for change. A particular need and hope is that special educators will be carefully planful, to the point of explicit documentations and evaluations, and that the funding sources for our field will loosen the bindings on their regulations so that the necessary developmental work for the difficult period ahead can be supported and accomplished.

An example of needed action is provided by the Division of Personnel Preparation of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped of the U. S. Office of Education. In the past several years, it has offered to all of its grantees the opportunity to go to bloc grants to break out of categorical grants, on the condition that a careful plan is presented--including a definite plan for evaluation. And with regard to evaluation, the focus has shifted to essential outcomes, rather than to processes that may or may not bear valid relation to program goals.

This kind of flexibility, extended, replicated, and responded to seriously, and a genuine sharing of knowledge and tools among all agencies, may possibly produce interesting activities for special educators and valuable education for exceptional children.

A Personal Statement of Alternatives and Preferences

This final section is a largely personal expression of preferences for goals special educators ought to seek and the instrumentalities they might use. I have tried to consider topics which touch on most of the trends, forces, and problems discussed in the earlier sections of this paper.

The "right to education" principle. Special educators are in the middle of what must be judged to be a truly remarkable event, one with profound philosophic and practical implications. This is the declaration that every child, even the most profoundly handicapped, shall be given formal opportunities to learn within the public education system. Right to education makes no reference to payoff for society of various institutions; the enhancement of the life of the individual is the sole consideration and goal.

Of course, some special educators and many others do not believe fully in the right to education principle. They will resist the difficult steps necessary to achieve full implementation of the principle in programs for the profoundly handicapped. Many educators still believe that education is a privilege and that children who fail to meet the standards established by school authorities should be demitted.

The education of severely handicapped children takes much time and money and some educators may feel that such expenditures lessen resources spent on other children. There is no evidence to support such a thesis; indeed, it can be argued that improvements in educational opportunities for the handicapped result in enhanced education for other children. In any case, I believe that special educators ought to stretch themselves to the very edge of their powers at this strategic time to help achieve in fact an appropriate education for every child. This proposes special efforts to develop programs for severely and profoundly handicapped students. If strong efforts are not made there is no assurance that progress will be made. The courts are only one of many sources of policy in our society and other forces could arise to erode the opportunities which now exist to push the margin of educational opportunity to their outermost edges.

Legislation. The field of special education finds itself increasingly hamstrung by a system of excessively narrow categorical funding and accounting. The "categorizing" and "labeling" of children, as presently practiced in special education, is largely unnecessary and self-defeating. The public outcry against the practice is mounting rapidly. The key practical changes required are at the level of legislation and regulations, at both federal and state levels. In a more fundamental sense, of course, the problem is conceptual and getting a "turn around" on basic concepts in the field may prove to be the most challenging problem.

So long as there are incentives for putting children on rosters of the "handicapped" we will continue on the self-defeating journey. Shifting aids to a "specialized personnel" or some other programmatic unit and opening up the ways by which special educators can serve children who need highly individualized programs should put special education into a new position in the urban communities where it is now in bad repute. Along with the shift in aids to a different unit, government agencies can, of course, require carefully framed programmatic plans by which everyone can be assured that first priority goes to children most in need of specialized supports and education.

This argument for the demise of categorical aids is directed only to their narrowest forms. In a broader sense, categorical funding for special programs seems essential for the foreseeable future. There are those who will wish to preserve narrowly categorical aids and the present child-in-category accounting systems but their narrow perspective, which permits special educators to stay in the bounds of the traditional categories and to excuse themselves from many of the difficult problems of education in urban ghettos, Indian reservations, and elsewhere, is not, I believe, a viable alternative for the future; unless, of course, one wishes to see the field defined in terms of only the most severely and profoundly handicapped.

A Broader Responsibility. An alternative to the narrow concept of special education and a corollary to the point of view expressed above favoring decategorization, is that special educators move aggressively on a broader front. Following are some of the domains in which special educators might well make a contribution: (a) helping to install systems for individualizing instruction for all children, making sure, for example, that all children in regular classes who need special help are being identified and assisted and that programs for the severely handicapped are advocated vigorously; (b) helping to improve education of children of minority groups through application of intensive individualized instructional systems; (c) forming new coordinating structures with fields such as "remedial reading;" (d) establishing school support systems for children with unusual needs so that they may be retained in "mainstream" situations and yet receive proper instruction; (e) leading the way in strengthening research and development activities in education of the context of the needs of exceptional children; (f) leading the way in self- and institutional development by launching retraining and program redesign activities of broad character; (g) strengthening broad technical assistance systems by which expertise in special fields can be shared on a broad regional or national basis.

In urging this broader mission, my assumption and belief is that special educators have a contribution to make in all of these domains. A further assumption is that if the field does not move on this broader front it will increasingly fail to draw energetic and able young people to its ranks, fail itself and the children it presumes to serve, and fail to be an actively and broadly engaged element in open society.

Shared Authority. One of the clear messages from much of the social change in America in recent decades is that the basic policies of institutions serving people should and shall be made by the poeple affected. On this basis, college students have asserted their roles in higher education, welfare recipients theirs in welfare agencies, and parents their rights to influence local school

policies. In special education, the concept of shared authority is also being implemented at the level of decisions affecting individuals--in the form of "due process" procedures. Special educators have had extraordinary opportunities to work with parents individually and in groups and presumably they are in the position to help lead the way in developing schoolwide systems that provide for participation of all persons affected in the decisions to be made. Assuming that one believes that authority for basic policy formulation ought to rest with those effected by the policies--and not everyone sees this as a positive value--then special educators have the basis for leading the way in creating new systems for structuring school policies and operations.

Two Broad Alternatives. Taken together and on the positive side, the above four elements comprise a broad agenda for the future of special education, one which will stretch the imagination and energies of everyone involved. Taken together, but on the negative side, special education has the alternative of a narrowly defined future, serving only the severely handicapped with special supports for special enclaves. The fact is, I think, that most of society--including most general administrators and leaders in education--see special education in its narrower versions and has little sense of the broader mission which it might perform.

But some general educators and many special educators do see the importance of opening up the enclaves and of joining the larger effort to serve all children. The severely handicapped need not be neglected as special education opens up and extends its engagements with regular education and the community at large. Indeed, it seems clear that school leaders are able to implement programs for the severely handicapped only when those with lesser handicaps have been well served and the margins of the special education move out gradually to encompass those with the most profound problems.

Decisions are being made every day in many places and at many levels on the extent to which special education will proceed in narrow categories or on a broader front, the extent to which special education will join in efforts for broad individualization of instruction, the ways "due process" requirements will or will not be implemented in the schools, the ways new legislation will effect program development, the ways roles of special educators will be defined in new certification standards and on many other topics and in many other ways. The patterns of investment made by special educators in the 1970s will be interesting to observe.

Even the biologists concede that the new evolution could be the produce of human awareness and decision, rather than simply of blind forces and trends. An unusual set of opportunities is present for special educators at this time to influence their future and that of the children they serve. We can only hope that their decisions will be equal to the challenge.

REFERENCES

Albee, G. W. Mental health manpower trends. New York: Basic Books, 1959.

Bijou, S. W. Theory and research in mental (developmental) retardation. Psychological Record, 1963, 13, 99.

Caplan, G. Support systems. In Caplan, R. B. Helping the helper to help. New York: Seabury Press, 1972.

Council for Exceptional Children. Basic Commitments and responsibilities to exceptional children. Arlington, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1971.

Braig, S. B. Fifty years of training teachers of the deaf. School and Society, 1942, 56 (1449), 302-303.

Deno, Evelyn (Ed.) Instructional alternatives for exceptional children. Arlington, Va.: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1973.

Dorken, H. A dimensional strategy for community focused mental health services. In Rosenblum, G. Issues in community psychology and preventive mental health. Task Force on Community Mental Health of Division 27 of the American Psychological Association. New York: Behavioral Publications, 1971.

Dunn, L. M. Special education for the mildly retarded - is much of it justifiable? Exceptional Children, 1968, 35, 5-22.

Gallagher, James J. Preparation of professional specialists for the mantally disturbed. Paper presented at Bureau of Education for the Handicapped Conference for Directors of Training Programs in Education of the Emotionally Disturbed, Nov. 1968.

Goldberg, I. I. & Cruickshank, W. M. The trainable but noneducable: Whose responsibility? NEA Journal, 1958, 47(9), 622.

Halsy, A. H. (Ed.) Ability and educational opportunity. Report of the Conference Organized by the Office for Scientific and Technical Personnel of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, June, 1961. Available in the U. S. from O.E.C.D. Mission, Publications Office, Suite 1223, 1346 Connecticut Ave. N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036

Heber, R. F. A manual on terminology and classification in mental retardation. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, Monograph Supplement, 1959, 64(2).

Hill, H. F. Vineland summer school for teachers of backward and mentally deficient children. The Training School Bulletin, 1945, May, 41-49.

Hunt, H. M. Intelligence and experience. New York: Ronald Press, 1961.

Lindsley, O. Direct measurement and prosthesis of retarded behavior. Journal of Education, 1964, 147, 62.

Mackie, R. P. Spotlighting advances in special education. Exceptional Children, 1945, 32, 77-81.

Mackie, R. P., & Dunn, L. N. College and university programs for the preparation of teachers of exceptional children. U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin 1954, No. 13. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1954.

McClelland, D. C. The achieving society. New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand, 1961.

News and Notes. Journal of Exceptional Children. 1948, March, 181.

Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Pennsylvania, 334 F. Supp. 1257 (E. D. Pa. 1971).

President's Committee on Mental Retardation. MR priority report: The retarded victims of poverty. Washington, D. C.: GPO, 0-310-156, 1968.

Quie, A. H. An address to the Executive Training Institute for Directors of Special Education, June 8-12, 1970, University of Indiana, Bloomington.

Reynolds, M. C. A framework for considering some issues in special education. Exceptional Children, 1962, 28(7), 367-370.

Reynolds, M. C. (Ed.) Special education and school system decentralization. Minneapolis, Minn.: Leadership Training Institute/Special Education, 1975.

Reynolds, M. C. & Davis, M. D. Exceptional children in regular classrooms. Minneapolis, Minn.: LTI/Special Education. Distributed by Dept. of Audio-Visual Extension, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 55455.

Riesman, D. Notes on meritocracy. Daedalus, 1967, 96 (3), 905.

Sloan, W. Four score and seven. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1963, 68 (1), 6-14.

Spears, H. Kappans ponder typical school procedures. Phi Delta Kappan, 1973, 54, 615-618.

Szasz, M. J. See the cat? See the Cradle? In M. C. Reynolds & M. D. Davis. Exceptional children in regular classrooms. Minneapolis, Minnesota: LTI/Special Education. Distributed by Dept. of Audio-Visual Extension. University of Minnesota, 1971, 31-42.

Wallin, J. E. W. Grade teachers are not qualified. The Nation's Schools, 1935, 10 (1), 38.

Wyatt v. Aderholt, 334 F Supp. 1341 (M. D. Alabama, 1971), 32FF. Supp. 781 (M. D. Alabama, 1971).

Zigler, E. Developmental versus difference theories of mental retardation and the problem of motivation. American Journal of Mental Dificiency, 1969, 73 (4), 536-556.